

Minutes of the Joint Public Hearing of the Murray City Municipal Council and the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City held Tuesday, September 13, 2005 in the Murray City Council Conference Room, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Attendance:

Jim Brass	Mike Penn	Cathy McKittrick
Pat Griffiths	John Hale	Floyd Armstrong
Krista Dunn	Tom Saul	Katherine Green
Jeff Dredge	Burgess Cline	Ed Brass
Robbie Robertson	Tim Leffel	Marge Brass
Mayor Dan Snarr	Jonnalyne Walker	Gary Snyder
Frank Nakamura	Gorm Klungervik	George Beronius
Keith Snarr	Christie Klungervik	Carl Tippets
Josh Yost	Anna Buhler	Don Patton
Jody Burnett	Ryan Jorgensen	Dick Stauffer
Alice Steiner	Kristen Swinyard	Shaun Delliskave
Steven Barnes	Rich Prime	Ed LaGuardia
Corabelle Crossley	Reed Cutler	Jan Wells

1. Approval of Minutes for May 4, June 14, July 12, August 9 and August 16, 2005

Jim Brass proposed that in the interest of time, the minutes be considered all at once.

Pat Griffiths moved for approval of the minutes with corrections to be provided to the assistant to the Redevelopment Agency.

Jeff Dredge seconded the motion.

5 Ayes
0 Nays

2. Consider a resolution adopting the Murray Fireclay Area Housing Plan.

Keith Snarr:

Mr. Snarr stated that the housing plan was presented to the RDA board in June, and subsequently was presented to the Taxing Entity Committee as part of the Draft RDA Plan. However, the housing plan was not adopted before the Fireclay Taxing Entity Committee adopted the Project Area Budget. That needs to be done today, and the Taxing Entity Committee will reconsider the budget at a later time.

Jim Brass noted that the Housing Plan has been on file for inspection since August 16, 2005.

Karen Wikstrom:

Ms. Wikstrom reminded the RDA Board that a housing plan is required by state statute. Redevelopment agencies are required to adopt a housing plan that specifies how housing monies are going to be spent in the project area or outside of the project area. The Fireclay housing plan first considers investment within the project area. The important sentence regarding investment in the project area begins by saying that "The means of providing housing within the Redevelopment Project Area will be varied." The area has insufficient infrastructure, so some of the housing investment may be made to allow housing to be developed in otherwise undevelopable areas. Some projects may meet the affordability price target and land may be made available at reduced cost; some projects may require assistance with structures parking; and some lands may be set aside for development of rental units, partially funded with low income housing tax credits. The means of implementing the project housing goals will be refined as an implementation program is created. The plan provides for 60% of the housing budget to be spent within the project area and 40% to be spent outside the project area. Murray City will work with non-profit and public housing providers to provide loans and grants for down payment assistance, remodeling, renovation, affordable housing financing, and other means of increasing or maintaining the affordable housing stock of Murray City. The plan covers how we are going to track this, with annual reports to be prepared for the board and an evaluation at the end of 10 years to determine what portion of the tax increment has been spent on housing and to adjust the program as needed to insure that by the time the project area is completed that the 20% requirement for housing has been met.

Jim Brass called for a motion on the resolution to adopt the Housing Plan for the Fireclay Redevelopment Project Area.

Jeff Dredge moved that the board adopt the resolution as presented.
Pat Griffiths seconded the motion.

5 Ayes
0 Nays

3. Joint Hearing of the Murray City Municipal Council and the Redevelopment Agency of Murray Utah, to consider adoption of a resolution of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City approving the Fireclay Project Area Plan and to consider adoption of an ordinance of the Murray City Municipal Council Adopting the Fireclay Project Area Plan.

Jim Brass opened the public hearing with following introduction.
In April 2004, the Redevelopment Agency adopted a resolution to study the Fireclay Redevelopment Survey Area. On November 9, 2004 and January 18, 2005, the Redevelopment Agency made a finding of blight under Utah Law for the Fireclay Redevelopment Survey Area and requested staff to prepare a redevelopment plan and budget. The proposed plan, which includes the housing plan, was reviewed by the City's Planning and Zoning commission and the Taxing Entity Committee. The proposed plan has been available for public inspection since August 16, 2005. The Redevelopment

Agency has determined that the Murray Fireclay Project Area needs rehabilitation and development to help insure viable economic life for the community. The proposed redevelopment plan envisions that infrastructure and other public uses as well as residential, commercial, office and open space uses will be developed within the project area. This plan and other actions by Murray City will guide and control the redevelopment in the Murray Fireclay Project Area. Tonight we will receive public comment from owners or representatives of owners of property within the project area and owners or representatives of owners of property within 300 feet of the project area and the general public.

Notice of the hearing was sent by certified mail to each assessment owner of property located within the project area and each assessment owner of property located outside but within 300 feet of the project area. Notices have also been sent to the State Tax Commission, Salt Lake County Assessor and Auditor, the State Board of Education, the Murray School District and the legislative or governing body of each taxing entity within the proposed project area. Additionally, the taxing entities were given an opportunity to meet with the RDA Director and discuss the plan on September 7, 2005. Notice has also been published in a newspaper of general circulation once a week for four successive weeks immediately preceding this hearing. At this point, Karen Wikstrom will present the plan, including the intent and purpose.

Karen Wikstrom

Ms. Wikstrom explained the Fireclay Redevelopment plan. She stated the following: What the board has received is the final draft of the redevelopment plan for the Murray Fireclay Project Area. The Murray Fireclay Area is roughly bounded by State Street on the East, 4500 South on the South, the Union Pacific Railroad tracks on the West, and the Murray City boundary on the north. This project area has been determined to meet the blight conditions as outlined in the statute and so is proposed as a redevelopment project area. The reasons for the selection of this project area is that because of the blighted conditions and limited or no accessibility, the project area will likely not develop through normal market means. Inadequate infrastructure supporting the project area will likely impede development through normal market means. A portion of the project area comprises a former steel plant, while another comprises a former smelter site. Because of the soil contamination on a portion of the project which was formerly a smelter and the fact that contaminated soil will likely remain on a portion of the project area beneath a cap or cover system, there will be extraordinary costs associated with developing this property in the future, thus making it non-competitive with alternative development properties in the Salt Lake Valley.

The purposes of the redevelopment plan are: to reduce or eliminate blight, strengthen the tax base and economic health of the city and the entire State of Utah; to provide quality development to insure the long term physical and economic vitality of the project area; to reduce traffic hazards through appropriate site access; to plan project parking, signing and pedestrian access to reduce vehicle and pedestrian conflicts; and to encourage recreational uses and planning and construction of the trails and other amenities; and to

encourage the use of mass transportation service to reduce traffic congestion and increase access to the project area.

There are two changes in the project area plan document from the document that was published and available for public review. The first one is on page 8, under section 5, D, i where it says large scale master plan. This section originally read that the proposed master plan for the bulk of the project area is included in Appendix D and made part of this plan. It indicates the type and location of new land uses and facilities to be introduced into the project area and the major new circulation routes that are planned for the area. Now because the adoption of the Transit-Oriented Development zoning ordinance and the guidelines associated with that ordinance will be the ruling documents for the project area, we have changed the language to as follows: The proposed master plan for the project area is included in Appendix D and made part of this plan. It generally indicates the type and location of new land uses to be introduced in the project area. However the general plan and zoning ordinance of Murray City will ultimately control the development process in the Fireclay Redevelopment Project Area.

The second change is on page 17, procedures for the collection of tax increment. The old draft said, notwithstanding the increases or decreases in the tax rate of a taxing agency as described in 17-B4-1004 of the act as a result of any statutes of items one, two and three. The fourth paragraph under paragraph three on your draft was noted as paragraph four, some language was missing. What that is replaced with is the amount of the base taxable value as described in 17-B4-1004 of the act to be used in determining tax increment shall be altered to reflect changes as described in 17-B4-1006 of the act as a result of: (i) any statutes enacted by the legislature, a judicial decision or an order from the Utah State Tax Commission to a county, to adjust or factor its assessment rate pursuant to subsection 59-704-02 UCA 1953 as amended. (ii) Changes and exceptions provided in Article 8 Section 2, Utah Constitution, or Section 59-02-103 UCA 1953 as amended, or (iii) Any increases or decreases in the percentage of fair market value as defined under Section 59-02-102 UCA 1953 as amended and Section 17B-4-1006 of the Act.

The next paragraph, and a full paragraph now states; (iv) The amount of money allocated and when collected paid to the agency each year for payment of bonds or other indebtedness may not be less than would have been allocated to and when paid to the agency each year, if there had been increase or decrease.

The only other changes from the draft to this final document is that we have inserted dates and have inserted the amount, percentage, and length of time for tax increment collection, which is 100% of tax increment for a period of 20 years with a \$4.6 million education mitigation payment.

The plan provides for transit-oriented development. It generally provides for commercial based TOD on the frontage of State Street, TOD mixed use in the core of the project, and TOD residential mixed use on the former steel plant site. The main infrastructure that the plan is intending to provide is the extension of Fireclay Avenue under the Union Pacific Railroad tracks, connecting with 300 West. There are other utilities that are not

distributed in the area generally beyond Main Street, needed to support development, and the extension of those utilities is also an objective of the plan.

Jim Brass

I have one question or comment. You're showing the land use up there between State and Main as TOD, but our TOD ordinance does not extend quite that far to the East of Main Street.

Karen Wikstrom

It doesn't, but your project area does and so what we're designating in your project area is that it is TOD Commercial. We have to have some kind of designation in your project area plan. Now, your TOD Ordinance will govern how that is implemented, but your project area boundary is State Street.

Jeff Dredge

That bulge that's there, I thought that the commercial zone started 15 feet East of Main Street.

Karen Wikstrom

This bulge reflects the illustrative plan that you all chose as your preferred plan with the big "round about."

Jim Brass

The overlying zone will ultimately dictate what gets built where.

Karen Wikstrom

The illustrative plans that we presented last spring contained an option with the "round about." So we've had the plan reflect the circulation system of your preferred illustrative plan. But again, if you recall the changes we made to the language under large scale master plan, this will be flexible because we know that you still have a great deal of studying and feasibility analysis to do with respect to the configuration of that road.

Krista Dunn

Back to Jim's question, I guess I still don't understand why we would have TOD Commercial instead of just commercial in the area East of Main Street.

Jim Brass

That's my only comment; if someone's thinking zone versus general use, the TOD zone extends 15 feet East of Main Street; beyond that we're still going with the City commercial zone.

Krista Dunn

To say its TOD Commercial is kind of misrepresenting what it is.

Karen Wikstrom

What if it said, TOD/Commercial?

Krista Dunn
That works for me.

Jim Brass
Any other questions?

I will invite public comment. Please come up to the podium and give us your name and address. Limit your comments to three minutes. Please get a comment form and fill it out for public record. We will open for public comment.

Gary Snyder – Deseret Industries, 50 East North Temple, Salt Lake City
I appreciate the questions, and I'm probably guilty of having missed another meeting. My recollection of this "round about" was possibly through the cannery property and not through the Deseret Industries property. This simply tells me that we need to continue to proceed with our application and conditional use permit, which we don't know if that's ideal for the entire development. Our approved conditional use permit is set back even further than our current store. It's a great concern.

Jim Brass
We will make note of that.

Tom Saul – TW Auto
I have more questions than comments. This Main Street was a shock to me, this is the first time I've seen that and I've been at every meeting. My questions, more than anything is how much we're in the dark on this whole thing? I've just spent \$100,000 which you've heard a thousand times, making my building and my property so it wasn't blighted anymore, or could be considered blighted. It's very nice, it's all modern and it's a lot of work. I don't know if I keep on buying furniture, where do I go, it's driving me crazy. Is it just going to get mowed down? Second, what is it, is it a Lowe's? Is it a Super Target? That latest one was a Walgreen's; everybody has different stories. Midas Muffler already says it's a done deal and that we're all getting mowed down. I'd like to know what you've heard, or where is it leaning or what's going on.

Krista Dunn
That's all news to us.

Jim Brass
One, your property would be within the commercial zone, not within the TOD. You do sit in the RDA, current state law prohibits us from using eminent domain to take anybody's property; no one's going to come in and bulldoze your property without your consent and your accepting what you would consider a reasonable offer. So I don't know that there's any done deal yet, unless you've sold your property.

Tom Saul

When do you think we'll know? Does this open the floodgates as far as people wanting to develop? Is there a timeframe? Do I go ahead and buy the new desk because I'm going to be there for a year, or is it ridiculous?

Krista Dunn

As it currently stands, you are absolutely fine where you're at.

Jeff Dredge

It's market driven.

Jim Brass

We would hope that this will generate development, particularly west of where you are, but to make a call for what happens along that State Street corridor, I don't think any of us can make that call yet.

Carl Tippets

I have three units in the Fireclay Plaza at 4322 South Main and to say that we're perfectly fine because it's declared blight, I now have three empty units that sit at Fireclay Plaza, because tenants have moved out because of all the uncertainty that has been expressed surrounding that. Those that had the option just picked up and moved on. So now I sit with mortgage payments and debt structure with no means of paying those, and you have no indication as to when it goes on. How long do I go on paying for empty space that I can't lease, not knowing where it's going?

Jim Brass

When the plan is adopted, assuming the plan is adopted and the budget is adopted, then this starts. Developers can start giving us proposals on how the plan on developing it; it's almost immediate. We've got people who are ready and anxious to go. Keith, would you want to comment on that.

Keith Snarr

Assuming the plan is adopted, there's a 60-day waiting period of appeal, before the plan takes effect. Then under the statute, we're required as an agency to go out and invite the owner participation proposals from the property owners; that process can take a few months. You're probably looking at at least a year before anything will go by the time we get through that process and applications start to come to the Planning Commission for development and review. I'll interject into that, the time for property acquisition which is going to be taken care of on the private side. The city won't be involved with that, because we won't have the eminent domain. That's going to lengthen out property development even longer. So I think it's not going to be something that will happen overnight. The projections of our budget, which we'll talk about shortly, list the beginning date for the Redevelopment Agency receiving tax increment between 2009 to 2013. Realistically, there is a period of a few years before the development is in place and starts to generate any property tax revenue in the redevelopment project area. I haven't answered your question, but that's about the best we can do is to explain it in those terms.

Carl Tippetts

The only other comment I'd have then is that I'm supposed to keep making mortgage payments for one, two, three years on empty spaces. It's a pretty big hardship that you've placed upon some individuals.

Jim Brass

Any other comments?

John Hale

976 East 5750 South. I haven't attended all of these meetings, but I have attended some. My understanding that the way that the tax revenue will work is that now a certain amount of property tax is collected and after new construction an additional amount will be collected and this additional amount will pay off a bond. My concern is that this is being proposed and presented as something that pays for itself and I think something's been left out here. This additional amount that goes to pay the bond if it was collected in any other development, we would be told it was necessary to pay all the multitude of government services for Murray and the county, and that it had to be collected because it increased demand on government services. In this project, it isn't going to pay for those government services but the new demand will be created and I have a feeling that this \$38.9 million bond that will be paid off by these additional taxes that would have gone to pay for additional government services, will have to be made up in new property taxes for all existing Murray residents and county residents, to make up for school costs, fire, police, sewer, road maintenance that are listed on our property taxes. Every one of these items throughout the next couple of years is going to need an increase in budget because of the new demand from the new businesses and residences in the Fireclay Area. I think there's going to be meeting after meeting with each government entity saying we have to have more money because our budgets don't have enough money in them. What I'm leading toward is this \$38.9 million that's going to have to be paid off to pay for this bond is going to result in about the same amount in tax increases for all existing Murray and county taxpayers. This is not going to really pay for itself.

Krista Dunn

I'd love to respond to that, because over the last 40 years Murray has expanded multiple times without increasing taxes. We just three years ago annexed 25% more population without increasing taxes.

John Hale

There was a huge tax windfall by that annexation.

Jim Brass

No there wasn't, actually we're about \$2 million in the hole servicing these areas.

John Hale

How much additional taxes were recovered from the annexation.

Jeff Dredge

Not enough to cover the costs.

John Hale

Where will the money come from the pay for the services for this Fireclay Project?

Krista Dunn

The same place they're coming from right now. We're not talking about extreme increase in services. We've increased numerous times without having to increase taxes.

John Hale

I still predict in the next couple of years we'll see entity after entity say we have a new demand; we need more money for our budget.

Mayor Snarr

First of all, for the last several years we haven't had a property tax increase. Our property taxes, as you're probably aware are the lowest in Salt Lake County except for a fraction of South Salt Lake. Regarding the sewer and the water, they are enterprise funds; they generate their own revenue based upon the usage of those services. They'll be self funding. If we're putting in brand new roads down there, if it's a PUD down there in between the rail tracks, they'll take care of the roads themselves, except for Fireclay. We're not generating very much money down there as it is right now.

John Hale

But you're not having to provide many services either.

Mayor Snarr

Here's the thing you have to understand, the area on the other side that goes up to 300 West, that area will come back to life. It takes a large amount of policing right now and is a drain on the City's budget because it doesn't provide value back to the city. The short of it is, if we don't do something here, nothing will ever happen in this area. There also will be a significant amount of sales tax generated from that area that we do not receive now, and that will more than satisfy taking care of the additional services required down there.

Doug Hill

I just have a question and I apologize if this was covered in the opening presentation; I was late. This road as drawn on the plan, showing the circular road concept, my question is, what happens if a developer or an environmental study that the city does for the construction of this road shows that the road needs to be in a different place, or the developer wants it in a different place. How does that affect the plan and what process do we have to go through, if any, to address the plan. By adopting the plan, are we adopting that road configuration as it is?

Karen Wikstrom

No. That we made sure in an amendment on page 8, that states that what rules is the zoning and design guidelines and the general plan. This is just a general indication and we did it in this way to conform to the preferred alternative selected by the Board last May. It is not designating a road; it is saying this could happen. It might not, and there certainly will be further study on the feasibility of that roadway.

Jim Brass

Before we close the public hearing, have we received any written comments that need to enter into the record?

Keith Snarr

We've received no written comments, and no one attended the consultation session we had for the taxing entities.

4. Consider approval of the Murray Fireclay Project Area Redevelopment Plan.

Jim Brass

I'm now going to close the public hearing. We will recess as the City Council and convene as the Redevelopment Agency Board. What we want to do now is discuss comments and adjust the plan as necessary based on comments if anyone so desires. I have one that I was going to throw in the mix just to stir everybody up, and that is eminent domain. We did put eminent domain back into the plan; we did attend an intergovernmental roundtable meeting. The impression I got was that's not happening. If they do RDA reform I don't think they're going to put eminent domain in it, personally I would like to see that language removed, so that we don't stir up anyone at the State level. We have enough issues with RDA's as it stands and I don't know that we would ever actually want to exercise that at all.

Robbie Robertson

I agree with that. Besides that, it confuses the public. There are enough rumors out there without creating more.

Krista Dunn

I have no problem with that.

Pat Griffiths

That was my inclination when I voted nay at the last meeting. So I concur.

Jeff Dredge

The thought of ever using eminent domain makes me sick, however it is a tool that, should the legislature ever change, in my opinion it would be sad not to have that arrow in our quiver if we had one piece of property that was holding up all this work.

Krista Dunn

This body cannot bind future bodies anyway. So let's say that we make a motion here to remove that language, there's nothing to stop the next in there from saying, we need to

put this language back, because the legislature has now allowed us to do that, which was our reasoning for doing it last time.

Alice Steiner

If you take the eminent domain out of the plan tonight, then in order to put it back in, you would have to amend the plan. And depending upon what the legislature says in terms of amending the plan. At the current time, to amend the plan, you would have to find the area to be blighted again, so that if you go through the process of making improvements and eliminate some of the blight, that may be a hurdle that you may not be able to get over in the future.

Jim Brass

But we can still use it for roads as the city, and I guess my question to you having attended that meeting, what do you think the odds are of that happening?

Alice Steiner

There was one very powerful member of the legislature that made his opinion very clear; there are many more people in the legislature than he. I think that given the current mood of the legislature, it is unlikely to happen definitely within the next two years. I think that at some time in the future, when there is a project that can't proceed because for example, a tenant is holding out and cannot be condemned out of a property, a tenant with a 20-year lease, or you have a family dispute and they cannot reach a determination about to dispose of property and eminent domain would resolve those issues, something will come back to the legislature and there will be some form of eminent domain put back in the legislation.

Jeff Dredge

The way that I read it as it is, there's no harm, no foul by it being there, and it sounds to me like if it's ever needed, it's more of a hassle to put it back in than to just leave it in there in its inane form.

Jim Brass

Anything else that we want to see adjusted on this plan, other than perhaps the location of that road.

Pat Griffiths

Perhaps for clarification, for the information of the audience, would you like to read that section on eminent domain, so that they know what it expresses?

Jim Brass

I will read it. "The agency reserves the right to acquire property through eminent domain, should such power be granted by future amendments to the Act. If the agency chooses to obtain property in the project area through the use of eminent domain, it will commence the acquisition of property through eminent domain no later than five years from the effective date of this plan."

Since I brought it up, I'll ask if anyone wants to make that change, we should have a motion and a vote for the change and then to adopt the resolution.

Pat Griffiths

I guess I'm thinking of Alice's comments on if a tenant had a long term lease; I'm thinking of a long-term lease in our city right now that's a real pain to us. I'd hate to get into another situation like that even though the circumstances would be different.

Jim Brass

I would entertain a motion to adopt the resolution approving the Fireclay Project Area Plan as written.

Motion by Krista Dunn

Seconded by Jeff Dredge

5 Ayes

0 Nays

5. City Council action to approve Murray Fireclay Project Area Plan.

We now recess as the Redevelopment Agency Board and reconvene as the Murray City Council. Again we consider all written and oral comments received on the plan and adjust the plan as necessary, which we have already done.

I would entertain a motion to adopt the ordinance for the Proposed Fireclay Project Area Plan, as approved by the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City.

Motion by Robbie Robertson

Seconded by Pat Griffiths

5 Ayes

0 Nays

6. Consider approval of the Murray Fireclay Project Area Budget.

We will now adjourn as the City Council and reconvene as the Redevelopment Agency Board. Now we will consider the budget. The budget under consideration tonight is intended to implement the plan. The budget is based on 100% of the tax increment generated by the project area for 20 years, paid the agency. The budget includes a 4.69 million dollar education mitigation payment made over the life of the project and \$7.8 million for affordable housing in Murray City, including housing-related infrastructure within the Fireclay Project Area. This is the time and date for the public hearing. The budget has been available for public inspection since August 16, 2005. The budget was approved by the Taxing Entity Committee on August 16, 2005, and we will open this public hearing with staff presentation by Keith Snarr.

Keith Snarr

Jonnalynne Walker is our consultant who has helped prepare the Fireclay budget; we have had the budget summary published according to State Statute. Jonnalynne can answer any questions. We did have one situation that we ran into with Cottonwood Improvement District, where we had failed to notice them of some of these proceedings and that they would be represented by Daniel Barr on the Taxing Entity Committee. I did meet with their Board yesterday and explained the process that we have been through and the actions of the Taxing Entity Committee. The Cottonwood Improvement District Board passed a resolution endorsing Daniel Barr and his actions to this point on their behalf. So they have been informed and are agreeable to what has proceeded to this point.

Frank Nakamura

I have a comment on behalf of staff. We would request the Redevelopment Agency Board to continue the public hearing on the budget. We have decided that we need to present this to the Taxing Entity Committee with the adoption of the housing plan. We just adopted the housing plan in this meeting, and we would like the opportunity to go to the Taxing Entity Committee with the housing plan available to them. So we would ask your consideration to continue this public hearing on the budget to October 11, 2005.

Krista Dunn

Frank, does that mean that the taxing entity committee must re-vote?

Frank Nakamura

They have been informed, they have a copy of the housing plan, and they will have the opportunity to re-approve it with the housing plan available to them.

Jeff Dredge

It seems to me that in their last meeting we were told that wasn't necessary. Is this just an extra mile type of thing?

Keith Snarr

As we look at the statute, it states that the housing plan should be approved prior to the Taxing Entity Committee considering the budget. We had failed to do that, so we need to convene them now the housing plan is in place and have another meeting. We're proposing the date of September 27, 2005 at 9:00 a.m. for the Taxing Entity Committee to meet once more and to review the housing plan and again take action on the budget, and then we would ask to continue the hearing on the budget and action by the Redevelopment Agency Board to October 11, 2005, which is the normally scheduled day for our next Redevelopment Agency meeting.

Frank Nakamura

We do recommend that you take public comment as pursuant to the notice. The budget has been available since August 16, and the taxing entity committee has seen the budget, so we are advising you to proceed with public comment. However, we would ask you to defer any decision on the budget until October 11.

Pat Griffiths

Frank, then it's not acceptable to approve it contingent upon their final approval?

Frank Nakamura

You could; however, it is our feeling that we have a great respect for our Taxing Entity Committee and we would not want to be presumptuous as to their vote, so with all due respect, we want to give them that opportunity.

Jim Brass

We will open the public comment period on the budget. Please limit your comments to three minutes. Seeing no comment, I entertain a motion to continue the public hearing until October 11, 2005 at 4:00 pm.

Motion by Jeff Dredge

Seconded by Robbie Robertson

5 Ayes

0 Nays

The meeting was adjourned.